

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/053,238	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HONDA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Hai C. Pham	<b>Art Unit</b> 2861	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hai C. Pham.

(3) Attorney Stephen Palan.

(2) Attorney Jeffrey D. Sanok.

(4) Tatsuo Fushiki, Naohiro Kosugi, Katsuo Nagi  
YAMAHA.

Date of Interview: 01 November 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: See Continuation Sheet.

Claim(s) discussed: 14.

Identification of prior art discussed: Iwasaka (U.S. 6,329,035), Kobayashi (JP 11-161768).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



HAI PHAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

changing layer. The printing method exclusive to Yamaha allows a fast label printing time and produces a desirable visible image.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

1. Applicants' Representative argues that the claim language in claims 30-32 are definite since it is proper to use the term "at least one" to claim one or more elements of the same nature although the specification indicates that the preferred embodiment includes plural elements having the same properties.
2. Applicants' Representative further argues that the secondary reference in Kobayashi is a non-analogous art and that there is no motivation for one having skill in the art to look at the teaching regarding a medium that displays a holographic art as taught in the secondary reference. Applicants' Representative also argues that there is no suggestion of an intermediate layer having trasnlucence and/or light scattering characteristics. The examiner indicates that Kobayashi teaches an intermediate layer having a diffraction grating on its surface that diffuses the light, and that the examiner will look further into whether the disclosed intermediate layer has the same function as that of the intermediate layer as claimed.

HCP

11/01/05